<u>Amendments to the Drawings:</u>

Please replace the original five sheets for Figures 1-4 with the submitted five replacement sheets for Figures 1-4. The Figures 1-4 have been corrected to comply with 37 CFR 1.21(d) and to add reference characters to Figures 3A-3D. No new matter was added.

Attachment: Five replacement sheets for Figure 1-4.

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-20 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found, but is not limited to, in Figures 2-4 and pages 4-5 and 8-13 of the specification. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 1-20 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because they are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) and because Figures 3A-3D lack reference characters. Herein, five replacement sheets for Figures 1-4 in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are being submitted, showing reference characters in Figures 3A-3D. No new matter was added.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because acronyms are used without including a description in plain text, a typographical error appears on page 13, line 6, and the details of Figures 3A-3D are discussed without use of reference characters. Herein, the disclosure has been amended to correct these informalities.

35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) Rejections

Claims 1-5 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,757,897 (hereafter Shi). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Focusing on Independent Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Shi fails to disclose all the claim limitations of Independent Claim 1. At page 4, the Office Action cites Col.4, line 5-19, of Shi as disclosing tasks being able to request a particular waiting period during execution. A review of this citation of Shi reveals that a "first task" of a primary task priority has the ability to "yield time" via a yield signal to "second tasks" of a non-critical class of tasks while the "second tasks" do not have the ability to "yield time" via the yield signal to the "first task" of a primary task priority. Further, Shi states at Col. 16, lines 34-39, and Col. 17, lines 5-14, that tasks besides the primary task 2.1 and other Class 2 tasks do not perform the yield operation. Furthermore, Shi describes at Col. 16, lines 48-61, that tasks of the same class or priority may be provided the ability to "yield time" to lower priority tasks to prevent task starvation. In contrast, Independent Claim 1 recites the limitation, "enabling any task irrespective of priority value to request a particular waiting period during execution of said task," (emphasis added). While Shi is directed to providing a portion of the tasks the ability to "yield time", Independent Claim 1 is directed to enabling any task irrespective of priority value to request a particular waiting period. Shi never describes enabling any task irrespective of priority value to request a particular waiting period ("yield time") during execution of the task.

Also, Shi shows in Figures 3, 4, and 5A-5C the yield signal for "yield time" being initiated by a task (e.g., first task and task 2.1) upon the occurrence of a

first time period Y during the performance of the task. Unlike Shi, Independent Claim 1 recites the limitation, "wherein said task requesting said particular waiting period occurs irrespective of elapsed time due to execution of said task," (emphasis added). That is, occurrence of a task requesting the particular waiting period happens irrespective of elapsed time due to execution of the task. Shi fails to show that the task requesting the particular waiting period ("yield time") occurs irrespective of elapsed time due to execution of the task.

As discussed above, the reference Shi does not disclose all the claim limitations of Independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by Shi and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-5 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over Shi. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-5 are patentable over Shi for the reasons discussed above.

Independent Claim 8 is directed to computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions stored therein for performing a method of executing a plurality of tasks of different priority values. Independent Claim 8 recites limitations similar to limitations of Independent Claim 1. Specifically, Independent Claim 8 recites, "enabling any task irrespective of priority value to request a particular waiting period during execution of said task, wherein said task requesting said particular waiting period occurs irrespective of elapsed time due to execution of said task," as is recited in Independent Claim 1. As discussed above with respect to Independent Claim 1, Shi fails to disclose this recited portion of Independent Claim 8. Therefore, Independent Claim 8 is not

anticipated by Shi and is in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 9-12 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 8, which is allowable over Shi. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 9-12 are patentable over Shi for the reasons discussed above.

,

35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 6-7 and 13-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,757,897 (hereafter Shi) in view of Bower, U.S. Patent No. 7,051,331 (hereafter Bower). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claims 6-7 are allowable over Shi because they are dependent on Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over Shi. Moreover, Bower fails to disclose claim limitations of Independent Claim 1 not shown by Shi. In particular, Bower does not disclose "enabling any task irrespective of priority value to request a particular waiting period during execution of said task, wherein said task requesting said particular waiting period occurs irrespective of elapsed time due to execution of said task," as recited in Independent Claim 1. Therefore, Independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Shi and Bower and is in condition for allowance. Since Dependent Claims 6-7 depend from Independent Claim 1, Dependent Claims 6-7 are patentable over the combination of Shi and Bower and are in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 13-14 are allowable over Shi because they are dependent on Independent Claim 8, which is allowable over Shi. Moreover, Bower fails to disclose claim limitations of Independent Claim 8 not shown by Shi. In particular, Bower does not disclose "enabling any task irrespective of priority value to request a particular waiting period during execution of said task, wherein said task requesting said particular waiting period occurs irrespective of elapsed time due to execution of said task," as recited in Independent Claim 8. Therefore, Independent Claim 8 is patentable over the combination of Shi and Bower and is in condition for allowance. Since Dependent Claims 13-15 depend from Independent Claim 8, Dependent Claims 13-14 are patentable over the combination of Shi and Bower and are in condition for allowance.

Now discussing Independent Claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 15 is patentable over the combination of Shi and Bower because the combination of Shi and Bower fails to disclose all the claim limitations of Independent Claim 15. At page 8, the Office Action cites Col.4, line 5-19, of Shi as disclosing tasks being able to request a particular waiting period during execution. A review of this citation of Shi reveals that a "first task" of a primary task priority has the ability to "yield time" via a yield signal to "second tasks" of a non-critical class of tasks while the "second tasks" do not have the ability to "yield time" via the yield signal to the "first task" of a primary task priority. Further, Shi states at Col. 16, lines 34-39, and Col. 17, lines 5-14, that tasks besides the primary task 2.1 and other Class 2 tasks do not perform the yield operation. Furthermore, Shi describes at Col. 16, lines 48-61, that tasks of the same class or priority may be provided the ability to "yield time" to lower

priority tasks to prevent task starvation. Moreover, Bower <u>never</u> discusses tasks being able to request a particular waiting period during execution

In contrast, Independent Claim 15 recites the limitation, "wherein said BIOS is operative to <u>enable any initialization task irrespective of priority value</u> to request a particular waiting period during execution of said initialization task," (emphasis added). While Shi is directed to providing <u>a portion of the tasks</u> the ability to "yield time" and Bower is silent on this subject matter, Independent Claim 15 is directed to a BIOS being operative to enable <u>any initialization task irrespective of priority value</u> to request a particular waiting period. Shi and Bower <u>never</u> describe a BIOS enabling <u>any initialization task irrespective of priority value</u> to request a particular waiting period ("yield time") during execution of the initialization task.

Also, Shi shows in Figures 3, 4, and 5A-5C the yield signal for "yield time" being initiated by a task (e.g., first task and task 2.1) upon the occurrence of a <u>first time period Y</u> during the performance of the task. Bower is silent on this subject matter. Unlike Shi and Bower, Independent Claim 15 recites the limitation, "wherein said initialization task requesting said particular waiting period <u>occurs irrespective of elapsed time due to execution</u> of said initialization task," (emphasis added). That is, occurrence of an initialization task requesting the particular waiting period happens <u>irrespective of elapsed time due to execution</u> of the initialization task. Shi and Bower <u>fail</u> to show that the initialization task requesting the particular waiting period ("yield time") <u>occurs irrespective of elapsed time due to execution</u> of the initialization task.

As discussed above, the combination of Shi and Bower does not disclose all the claim limitations of Independent Claim 15. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 15 is patentable over the combination of Shi and Bower and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 16-20 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 15, which is allowable over the combination of Shi and Bower. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 16-20 are patentable over the combination of Shi and Bower for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments and remarks overcome all rejections and objections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-20) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-20) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO HAO & BARNES, LLP

Dated: ___7/30/2007___

Jose S. Garcia
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9080 ext. 128 Direct Line
(408) 938-9060 General Line

Attachments: Five replacement sheets for Figures 1-4